DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 376 CS 008 113

AUTHOR Van Tiem, Darlene
TITLE A Study of the Reading Skills of Juniors and Seniors at Marygrove College: Winter Term, 1983.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 24p.; Several pages contain small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; English Instruction; Higher Education; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Comprehension; Reading Improvement; *Reading Research; *Reading Skills; Vocabulary; *Vocabulary Skills
IDENTIFIERS Nelson Denny Reading Tests

ABSTRACT

A study of the vocabulary and comprehension scores of juniors and seniors at Marygrove College was conducted during the winter term of 1983 in order to determine the reading levels needed for success in upper division courses. Because the research was designed to determine the reading levels needed for successful study, students on academic probation or taking more than one developmental course were eliminated from the potential sample. Sixty-six students were given the Nelson Denny Reading Test, Form F; three were subsequently eliminated, leaving 24 seniors and 39 juniors in the sample. Juniors had an average college sophomore reading level, and seniors had an average reading equivalent of late college freshman year. However, the scores encompassed a very wide range, indicating that a wide variety of reading levels is applicable for successful study at the college level. It appears that juniors and seniors who have taken developmental reading never attain the reading level of those students who did not take such courses, but they do persevere. Therefore, it might be better to admit students with reading deficiencies and then provide the appropriate educational support to enable them to achieve a meaningful liberal arts education. Numerous tables and charts provide participant test scores and other data. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED260376

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Study of the Reading Skills of Juniors and Seniors at Marygrove College: Winter Term, 1983

By
Darlene Van Tiem
Director of the Learning Skills Center
Marygrove College
Detroit, MI 48221

Compiled by
Matthew Stockard

CS008113

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Darlene M. Van Tiem

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents

I. Design and Population

II. Results

III. Conclusion and Recommendations

IV. Appendices

A. Consent Form

B. Demographic Data Sheet

C. Letter Sent to Participants

D. Nelson-Denny Grade-Equivalent Conversion Chart

E. Schools Participating in Standardization of Nelson-Denny National Norms

F. Reading Norms of Marygrove Developmental Reading Students: April, 1981

A Study of the Reading Skills of

Juniors and Seniors at Marygrove College:

Winter Term, 1983

Darlene Van Tiem

I. Design and Population

A study of the vocabulary and comprehension scores of juniors and seniors at Marygrove College was conducted during the winter term of 1983. The goal was to determine the reading levels needed for successful study of upper division courses.

A junior was defined as a student having completed at least sixty-four semester credits of work toward a Marygrove degree; senior status requires at least ninety-six semester credits. Because the study was designed to determine the reading levels needed for successful study, students on academic probation or taking more than one developmental or foundational course were eliminated from the potential sample.

Classes were identified that had the largest number of juniors and seniors that met the qualifications of the study. The classes

were then checked to reduce the possibility of duplicate testing within the potential test classes.

Eleven instructors were asked to cooperate in the study after it was determined that their classes fit the sample criteria. Nine instructors were willing to participate in the study. Arrangements were made for the administration of the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Form F during regularly-scheduled class times. Research assistants Lore Werner and Kimberly Hayes administered the tests during late March and early April of 1983.

Sixty-six students were tested; three were subsequently eliminated from the sample due to failure to provide demographic data or ineligibility based on the sample criteria. All students were informed of the nature of the study, their anonymity, and that taking the test was entirely optional. Participating students were invited to request a copy of the research results. Letters containing national norms, Marygrove norms, and individual results were mailed to the participants requesting them on May 6, 1983.

The Nelson-Denny Reading Test: Form F is a standardized, nationally-normed test that measures reading ability in terms of

vocabulary, comprehension, and rate. The test requires thirty-five minutes of actual work time. Designed for administration to grades nine through sixteen (equivalent to college senior level), the Nelson-Denny is "the most popular standardized reading test in American colleges and universityie [sic] - highly respected, carefully researched, thoroughly normed."*

The total undergraduate population of Marygrove College in the fall of 1982 included:

Males	187	(18.6%)
Females	817	(81.4%)
Blacks	700	(69.7%)
Whites	286	(28.5%)
Other	18	(1.8%)

The sample of sixty-three juniors and seniors included:

Males	11	(17.5%)
Females	52	(82.5%)
Blacks	41	(65.1%)
Whites	20	(31.7%)
Other	2	(3.2%)

There were twenty-four seniors and thirty-nine juniors in the sample. Based on the Nelson-Denny placement test scores of

---

* College and Adult Reading - XIth NCRA Yearbook. Published by the North Central Reading Association. University of Minnesota: 1982, p. 97.

eighteen of the seniors and thirty-three of the juniors in the sample, the seniors had an average reading grade-equivalent of 12.3, which is approximately in the middle of their senior year in high school, when they entered Marygrove. Entrance scores for the juniors were slightly higher at 13.7, which is the average score of a person in the middle of his/her freshman year in college. It is important to note, however, that many of the students were transfer students and that the entrance reading levels do not necessarily reflect the sample's reading levels as freshmen/women.

II. Results

The reading scores obtained in the study from the juniors are summarized as follows:

	Percentile Range*	Percentile Average	S.D.	Approx. Grade Level
Vocabulary	3 - 97	37	16.18	14.8
Comprehension	2 - 9	25	10.84	13.7
Total (V plus C)	2 - 98	30	25.32	14.4

*Percentiles are based on national junior norms

The scores obtained from the seniors are summarized as follows:

	Percentile Range*	Percentile Average	S.D.	Approx. Grade Level
Vocabulary	1 - 88	19	16.76	13.7
Comprehension	3 - 98	22	11.47	13.9
Total (V plus C)	1 - 87	19	26.23	13.9

*Percentiles are based on national senior norms

The juniors have an average college sophomore reading level; seniors have an average level of late in their freshman year. However, the scores encompass a very wide range. This suggests that a wide variety of reading levels is applicable to successful study at the college level.

When the sample was subdivided into blacks and whites, whites scored higher on vocabulary, comprehension, and total for both juniors and seniors (see Tables 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b). These differences were significant at the .02 level, which is unusually stringent for such small samples but was adopted for the study to compensate for the relative weakness of t tests. Tables 4a and 4b summarize the differences between blacks and whites. The differences between the seniors (Table 4b) should be treated cautiously due to the small number of whites (N = 6).

The results were mixed when the sample was subdivided into males and females (see Tables 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b). None of these differences, however, is significant at the .02 level (see Tables 5a and 5b). Again, the scores for males must be treated with caution due to the small sample (N = 11).

The differences between those students who have taken developmental reading courses and those who had not were fairly large (see Tables 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b) and highly significant (see Tables 6a and 6b).

Data on the age of the students are not presented due to the large percentage of participants who failed to report it. Data pertaining to the students' majors were not included because of the small sample sizes and because the computer program and statistical assistance needed to analyze such data were not available.

III. Conclusion and Recommendations

Although many of the obtained data were inconclusive (sex) or unusable (majors and age), the study did reveal that students from widely diverse backgrounds seem to be capable of successful study at the college level. This is especially important to keep in mind as the Marygrove College community of students, faculty and administration works to develop a wider, stronger appreciation and

understanding of the diversity among all humans and particularly within the City of Detroit.

It appears that juniors and seniors who have taken developmental reading never attain the reading level of those students who did not take such courses, but they do persevere. Therefore it may be better to admit students with reading deficiencies and then provide the appropriate educational support to enable them to achieve a meaningful liberal arts education.

The faculty can provide a great deal of this support by adapting the learning environment to encourage more reading practice. Daily, short reading assignments followed by frequent quizzes will help provide the structure and feedback needed by students with lower reading levels. Identifying words that are expected to present problems will help overcome the tendency of some readers to ignore unfamiliar words.

The selection of an appropriate textbook is important; a readability analysis based upon both the semantic and syntactic characteristics of the book should be performed before the final decision on a textbook is made.

Exit levels from the Learning Skills classes should be reconsidered. The average exit level from Education 105 is presently 12.3; however, the average level of juniors and seniors

who have had these classes is 12.0. The students' reading level appears to plateau and not improve. Perhaps students are avoiding reading assignments or reading only enough to obtain satisfactory grades and, as a possible result, do not improve their reading levels. It may be appropriate to expect exit levels to approximate 13.0, which is college freshman level.

Table 1a

Junior Reading Scores: Vocabulary

Variable	Mean	N	Range		S.D.	Grade Level
			Min	Max		
Blacks	51.20	25	29	79	11.55	13.9
Whites	69.57	14	39	98	16.91	16.4
Females	58.19	32	29	98	16.06	14.8
Males	56.00	7	41	84	17.91	14.6
No Reading	64.54	26	39	98	14.87	15.6
Had Reading	44.31	13	29	59	8.53	12.9
Total	57.79	39	29	98	16.18	14.8

Table 1b

Senior Reading Scores: Vocabulary

Variable	Mean	N	Range		S.D.	Grade Level
			Min	Max		
Blacks	43.44	16	26	73	11.99	12.7
Whites	59.67	6	47	78	13.32	15.0
Females	50.30	20	26	95	18.01	13.7
Males	51.00	4	38	62	9.90	13.9
No Reading	63.55	11	47	95	14.81	15.5
Had Reading	39.31	13	26	53	7.99	11.8
Total	50.42	24	26	95	16.76	13.7

Table 2a

Junior Reading Scores. Comprehension

Variable	Mean	N	Range		S.D.	Grade Level
			Min	Max		
Blacks	44.08	25	26	62	9.46	12.5
Whites	53.71	14	30	70	10.69	15.1
Females	46.38	32	26	70	11.18	13.2
Males	52.86	7	44	62	7.65	14.9
No Reading	51.23	26	30	70	10.10	14.5
Had Reading	40.15	13	26	54	8.42	11.5
Total	47.54	39	26	70	10.84	13.7

Table 2b

Senior Reading Scores: Comprehension

Variable	Mean	N	Range		S.D.	Grade Level
			Min	Max		
Blacks	44.50	16	32	62	9.54	12.5
Whites	57.33	6	48	72	9.09	15.8
Females	49.30	20	32	72	11.30	13.9
Males	50.00	4	32	66	14.14	14.2
No Reading	59.09	11	48	72	7.34	16.6
Had Reading	41.23	13	32	54	7.00	11.8
Total	49.42	24	32	72	11.47	14.0

Table 3a

Junior Reading Scores: Total (Vocabulary plus Comprehension)

Variable	Mean	N	Range		S.D.	Grade Level
			Min	Max		
Blacks	95.28	25	55	141	18.12	13.5
Whites	123.29	14	69	168	26.97	16.0
Females	104.56	32	55	168	25.74	14.4
Males	108.86	7	85	146	24.90	14.7
No Reading	115.77	26	69	168	23.33	15.2
Had Reading	84.46	13	55	107	13.76	12.2
Total	105.33	39	55	168	25.32	14.4

Table 3b

Senior Reading Scores: Total (Vocabulary plus Comprehension)

Variable	Mean	N	Range		S.D.	Grade Level
			Min	Max		
Blacks	87.94	16	58	135	19.48	13.5
Whites	117.00	6	99	150	19.01	15.3
Females	99.60	20	58	159	27.86	13.9
Males	101.00	4	85	128	18.89	14.0
No Reading	122.64	11	99	159	19.26	16.0
Had Reading	80.54	13	58	98	11.39	11.9
Total	99.83	24	58	159	26.23	13.9

Table 4a

Reading Subskill scores of Junior Whites
Compared to Junior Blacks

Reading Subskill	Whites			Blacks			STATISTICS		
	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	t-value	df	Signif.
Vocabulary	14	69.75 (16.4)[1]	16.91	25	51.20 (13.9)	11.55	3.62	37	.001
Comprehension	14	53.71 (15.1)	10.69	25	44.08 (13.5)	9.46	2.81	37	.01
Total (V plus C)	14	123.29 (16.0)	26.97	25	95.28 (13.5)	18.12	3.47	37	.01

[1] Grade-Equivalents in parentheses

Table 4b

Reading Subskill Scores of Senior Whites
Compared to Senior Blacks

Reading Subskill	Whites			Blacks			STATISTICS		
	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	t-value	df	Signif.
Vocabulary	6	59.67 (15.0)[1]	13.32	16	43.44 (12.7)	11.99	2.61	20	.02
Comprehension	6	57.33 (15.8)	9.09	16	44.50 (13.5)	9.54	2.91	20	.01
Total (V plus C)	6	117.00 (15.3)	19.01	16	87.94 (13.5)	19.48	3.17	20	.01

[1] Grade-Equivalents in parentheses

Table 5a

Reading Subskill Scores of Junior Males
Compared to Junior Females

Reading Subskill	Males			Females			STATISTICS		
	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	t-value	df	Signif.
Vocabulary	7	56.00 (14.6)[1]	17.91	32	58.19 (14.8)	16.06	.30	37	N.S.
Comprehension	7	52.86 (14.9)	7.65	32	46.38 (13.2)	11.18	1.85	37	.10
Total (V plus C)	7	108.86 (14.7)	24.90	32	104.56 (14.4)	25.74	.41	37	N.S.

[1] Grade-Equivalents in parentheses

Table 5b

Reading Subskill Scores of Senior Males
Compared to Senior Females

Reading Subskill	Males			Females			STATISTICS		
	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	t-value	df	Signif.
Vocabulary	4	51.00 (13.9)[1]	9.90	20	50.30 (13.7)	18.01	.11	22	N.S.
Comprehension	4	50.00 (14.2)	14.14	20	49.30 (13.9)	11.30	.09	22	N.S.
Total (V plus C)	4	101.00 (14.0)	18.89	20	99.60 (13.9)	27.86	.12	22	N.S.

[1] Grade-Equivalents in parentheses

Table 6a

Reading Subskill Scores of Juniors Who Did Not Take Developmental Reading Compared to Juniors Who Have Taken Developmental Reading

Reading Subskill	Did Not Take Reading			Took Reading			STATISTICS		
	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	t-value	df	Signif.
Vocabulary	26	64.54 (15.6)[1]	14.87	13	44.31 (12.9)	8.53	5.39	37	.001
Comprehension	26	51.23 (14.5)	10.10	13	40.15 (11.5)	8.42	3.62	37	.001
Total (V plus C)	26	115.77 (15.2)	23.33	13	84.46 (12.2)	13.76	5.26	37	.001

[1] Grade-Equivalents in parentheses

Table 6b

Reading Subskill Scores of Seniors Who Did Not Take Developmental Reading Compared to Seniors Who Have Taken Developmental Reading

Reading Subskill	Did Not Take Reading			Took Reading			STATISTICS		
	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	N	Mean R.S.	S.D.	t-value	df	Signif.
Vocabulary	11	63.55 (15.5)[1]	14.81	13	39.31 (11.8)	7.99	4.86	22	.001
Comprehension	11	59.09 (16.6)	7.34	13	41.23 (11.8)	7.00	6.07	22	.001
Total (V plus C)	11	122.64 (16.0)	19.26	13	80.54 (11.9)	11.39	6.37	22	.001

[1] Grade-Equivalents in parentheses

APPENDIX A

Information Sheet and Informed Consent Form
For Participants in Reading Norms Study

Marygrove College
S.D.I.P. Grant
Principal Investigator:
Darlene Van Tiem, M.A., M.Ed.

Purpose of the Research:

To determine the reading norms of juniors and seniors.

Selection of Participants:

All juniors and seniors are requested to complete a Nelson-Denny Reading Test Form E or F. The test requires 45 minutes to complete and will be administered during scheduled times.

Rights of Participants:

1. All information obtained will be treated in strictest confidence. Individual identities will not be disclosed on any research reports.

2. All participants are entitled to a report on the study in which they participate. Please indicate below if you would like to receive such a report:

( ) I do not wish to receive a survey report.

( ) I would like a copy of the survey report.

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

I have read and thoroughly understand the above, and I voluntarily agree to participate in the Reading Norms Study.

_____ Date: _____
Participant's Signature

APPENDIX B

Reading Norms Study
Demographic Data Sheet

Name: (print) _____

Major: _____

Date of Birth: ___/___/___ Sex: M F Junior ____ Senior ____

Race: _____

Have you ever taken Education 095 or 105? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, please indicate the term, year, and instructor:

	Term	Year	Instructor
EDU 095	_____	_____	_____
EDU 105	_____	_____	_____

(Do not write below this line)

Date:	Description:	V	C	T	G.E.
_____	_____	____	____	____	____
_____	_____	____	____	____	____
_____	_____	____	____	____	____
_____	_____	____	____	____	____
_____	_____	____	____	____	____
_____	_____	____	____	____	____

APPENDIX C

Marygrove College / 8425 West McNichols Road, Detroit, Michigan 48221 / (313) 862-8000

To: Reading Norms Study Participants
From: Darlene Van Tiem
Date: May 6, 1983

Dear

Thank you for your cooperation in this research. The nationwide average scores for college students taking the Nelson-Denny after February 1 are as follows:

	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Total	G.E.
Juniors	65	56	120	15.6
Seniors	72	59	131	16.6

The following are average scores for Marygrove students. Grade equivalents follow the raw scores; for example, 15.5 is the average skill level of a student in the middle of his/her junior year in college.

	Vocabulary		Comprehension		Total	
	Raw	G.E.	Raw	G.E.	Raw	G.E.
Juniors	58	14.8	48	13.7	105	14.4
Seniors	50	13.7	49	14.0	100	13.9

These are your scores:

	Vocabulary		Comprehension		Total	
	Raw	G.E.	Raw	G.E.	Raw	G.E.
	___	___	___	___	___	___

Thank you once again for your participation. If you have any questions regarding the research or your results, please feel free to contact the Learning Skills Center at 862-8000, extension 278.

Sincerely yours

Darlene Van Tiem

Darlene Van Tiem, M.A., M. Ed.
Principal Investigator,
Reading Norms Study
Coordinator,
Developmental Reading

DVT/ms

APPENDIX D

GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES FOR NELSON-DENNY — FORMS E & F

FORM E

RAW SCORE	GRADE EQUIVALENT			RAW SCORE	GRADE EQUIVALENT		
	VOCAB-ULARY	COMPRE-HENSION	TOTAL (V + 2C)		VOCAB-ULARY	COMPRE-HENSION	TOTAL (V + 2C)
172				86			12.7
171				85			12.6
170				84			12.4
169				83			12.3
168				82			12.2
167				81			12.1
166				80			12.0
165				79			11.9
164				78			11.8
163				77			11.6
162				76	16.9		11.5
161				75	16.8		11.3
160				74	16.6		11.2
159				73	16.5		11.1
158				72	16.4		11.0
157				71	16.3		10.8
156				70	16.2		10.7
155				69	16.0		10.6
154				68	15.9		10.5
153				67	15.7		10.3
152				66	15.6		10.2
151				65	15.4		10.1
150				64	15.3		9.9
149				63	15.2		9.8
148				62	15.1		9.7
147				61	15.0		9.6
146				60	14.9		9.4
145				59	14.8		9.2
144				58	14.7		9.0
143				57	14.6		8.8
142				56	14.5	16.5	8.6
141				55	14.3		8.4
140				54	14.2	15.7	8.2
139				53	14.0		8.0
138				52	13.9	15.1	7.9
137				51	13.7		7.8
136				50	13.6	14.7	7.7
135				49	13.5		7.5
134			16.9	48	13.4	14.2	7.4
133			16.8	47	13.3		7.2
132			16.7	46	13.2	13.7	7.0
131			16.7	45	13.0		6.8
130			16.6	44	12.9	13.1	6.6
129			16.5	43	12.7		6.4
128			16.4	42	12.5	12.4	6.2
127			16.3	41	12.3		6.0
126			16.2	40	12.1	11.8	5.8
125			16.1	39	11.9		5.6
124			16.0	38	11.6	11.2	5.4
123			16.0	37	11.4		5.2
122			15.9	36	11.1	10.7	5.0
121			15.8	35	10.9		4.8
120			15.7	34	10.6	10.1	4.6
119			15.6	33	10.4		4.4
118			15.5	32	10.1	9.4	4.2
117			15.4	31	9.9		4.0
116			15.3	30	9.6	8.6	3.9
115			15.2	29	9.4		3.7
114			15.1	28	9.1	7.9	
113			15.0	27	8.8		
112			15.0	26	8.5	7.3	
111			14.9	25	8.2		
110			14.8	24	8.0	6.7	
109			14.8	23	7.7		
108			14.7	22	7.4	6.0	
107			14.6	21	7.1		
106			14.5	20	6.8	5.5	
105			14.5	19	6.5		
104			14.4	18	6.2	4.9	
103			14.3	17	5.9		
102			14.2	16	5.6	4.4	
101			14.1	15	5.1		
100			14.0	14	4.6	3.8	
99			13.9	13	4.1		
98			13.8	12	3.6		
97			13.7	11			
96			13.7	10			
95			13.6	9			
94			13.5	8			
93			13.4	7			
92			13.4	6			
91			13.3	5			
90			13.2	4			
89			13.1	3			
88			13.0	2			
87			12.8	1			

FORM F

RAW SCORE	GRADE EQUIVALENT			RAW SCORE	GRADE EQUIVALENT		
	VOCAB-ULARY	COMPRE-HENSION	TOTAL (V + 2C)		VOCAB-ULARY	COMPRE-HENSION	TOTAL (V + 2C)
172				86			12.5
171				85			12.3
170				84			12.2
169				83			12.1
168				82			12.0
167				81			11.9
166				80			11.8
165				79			11.6
164				78			11.5
163				77			11.3
162				76			11.2
161				75			11.1
160				74	16.9		11.0
159				73	16.8		10.9
158				72	16.6		10.8
157				71	16.5		10.7
156				70	16.4		10.6
155				69	16.3		10.5
154				68	16.1		10.3
153				67	16.0		10.2
152				66	15.8		10.1
151				65	15.6		10.0
150				64	15.5		9.8
149				63	15.4		9.7
148				62	15.2		9.6
147				61	15.1		9.5
146				60	15.0	16.9	9.3
145				59	14.9		9.1
144				58	14.8	16.2	8.9
143				57	14.7		8.7
142				56	14.6	15.6	8.5
141				55	14.5		8.3
140				54	14.3	15.1	8.1
139				53	14.2		7.9
138				52	14.0	14.7	7.7
137				51	13.9		7.6
136				50	13.7	14.2	7.4
135				49	13.6		7.3
134				48	13.5	13.7	7.1
133			16.9	47	13.4		6.9
132			16.8	46	13.3	13.2	6.7
131			16.7	45	13.1		6.5
130			16.6	44	12.9	12.5	6.3
129			16.5	43	12.7		6.1
128			16.4	42	12.5	12.0	5.9
127			16.4	41	12.3		5.7
126			16.3	40	12.0	11.5	5.5
125			16.2	39	11.8		5.3
124			16.1	38	11.5	11.0	5.1
123			16.0	37	11.2		4.9
122			15.9	36	11.0	10.5	4.7
121			15.8	35	10.7		4.5
120			15.7	34	10.5	10.0	4.3
119			15.6	33	10.2		4.2
118			15.5	32	10.0	9.4	4.0
117			15.3	31	9.7		3.8
116			15.2	30	9.4	8.7	3.7
115			15.1	29	9.1		
114			15.1	28	8.8	8.0	
113			15.0	27	8.5		
112			14.9	26	8.2	7.3	
111			14.9	25	7.9		
110			14.8	24	7.7	6.6	
109			14.7	23	7.4		
108			14.7	22	7.2	5.9	
107			14.6	21	6.9		
106			14.5	20	6.7	5.3	
105			14.4	19	6.4		
104			14.3	18	6.1	4.7	
103			14.2	17	5.8		
102			14.1	16	5.5	4.2	
101			14.0	15	5.1		
100			13.9	14	4.6	3.6	
99			13.8	13	4.1		
98			13.7	12	3.6		
97			13.6	11			
96			13.6	10			
95			13.5	9			
94			13.4	8			
93			13.3	7			
92			13.2	6			
91			13.1	5			
90			13.0	4			
89			12.9	3			
88			12.7	2			
87			12.6	1			

APPENDIX E

Schools Participating in Standardization

High Schools

NORTHEAST

Maine: M.S.A.D. #70, Hodgdon H.S.; **Maryland:** Hartford County Schools, Hartford County H.S.; **Massachusetts:** Weymouth North H.S.; **New Hampshire:** Farmington H.S., **New York:** Greenwood Central H.S.; Salen Central H.S.; Whitesville Central H.S.; **Pennsylvania:** Aliquippa Borough H.S.; Conemaugh Township S.D., Conemaugh Township H.S.; Deer Lakes S.D., Deer Lakes H.S.; North Allegheny S.D., North Allegheny H.S.; Riverside S.D., Riverside H.S.; Diocese of Pittsburgh, Sacred Heart H.S.; **Vermont:** Bethel Township S.D., Whitcomb H.S.; Union District #5, Vergennes Union H.S.

SOUTHWEST

Louisiana: LaFourche Parish, Central LaFourche H.S.; **New Mexico:** Hobbs H.S.; **Oklahoma:** Bethany H.S.; Archdiocese of Oklahoma City, Mt. St. Mary's H.S.; **Texas:** Blanco H.S., Brady H.S.; Burleson H.S.; Crowley H.S.; Galveston Independent S.D., Ball H.S.; Diocese of Galveston, O'Connell Senior H.S., Hooks H.S.; Santa Anna H.S.; Texas City H.S.

SOUTHEAST

Alabama: Colbert County S.D., Colbert County H.S.; Diocese of Birmingham, Holy Family H.S.; **Florida:** Lee County S.D., Cypress Lake H.S.; **Kentucky:** Buckhorn H.S.; Elliott S.D., Elliott County H.S.; Letcher H.S.; Hopkins County S.D., South Hopkins H.S.; **Mississippi:** West Lauderdale S.D., West Lauderdale H.S.; **North Carolina:** Clinton H.S., Tryon H.S.; **Tennessee:** Alamo City H.S.; Roane County S.D., Midway H.S.; Marion County S.D., Sequatchie County H.S.; **West Virginia:** Lewis County S.D., Jane Lew H.S., Diocese of Wheeling, Notre Dame H.S.; Richwood S.D., Richwood Junior and Senior H.S.; Summersville Junior High

MIDWEST

Colorado: Roaring Fork RE-1, Basalt H.S.; **Illinois:** Flanagan H.S.; Yates City H.S., **Kansas:** Bucklin H.S.; Larned H.S.; Spearville H.S.; Wichita Catholic Schools, Bishop Carroll H.S.; **Minnesota:** Independent S.D. 473, Isle H.S.; Diocese of St. Cloud, Cathedral H.S.; Lake Superior S.D. #381, Two Harbors H.S., **Missouri:** Oregon County R-4, Alton H.S.; Fulton Senior H.S.; Diocese of Jefferson City, Helias H.S.; Lebanon Senior H.S.; **Nebraska:** District #300, Tri-County H.S., Falls City Senior H.S.; **North Dakota:** Central S.D., Central Junior H.S.; **Ohio:** Archdiocese of Cincinnati, Carroll H.S., Piqua H.S.; **Wisconsin:** Chilton H.S.; Wonewoc H.S.

FAR WEST

Montana: Baker H.S.; Lincoln County S.D., Lincoln County H.S.; Helena H.S., Diocese of Helena, Loyola-Sacred Heart H.S.; **Oregon:** Amity H.S.; Burns Union H.S.; **Utah:** Alpine S.D., Orem H.S., Lake Ridge Junior H.S., Orem Junior H.S.; Diocese of Salt Lake, Judge Memorial Catholic H.S.; **Washington:** Adna H.S., Wahkiakum S.D. #200, Wahkiakum H.S.; Federal Way S.D., Lakota Junior H.S., Sacajaway H.S., Totem Junior H.S., Decatur H.S., Federal Way H.S., Thomas Jefferson; Clover Park S.D., Lakes H.S., Clover Park H.S., Mann Junior H.S.; Longview S.D., Mark Morris H.S., R.A. Long H.S., Tumwater H.S.

2-Year Colleges

NORTHEAST

Maryland: Essex Community College; **Massachusetts:** Roxbury Community College; **New Jersey:** Brookdale Community College, Burlington Community College; **New York:** Broome Community College; **Pennsylvania:** Keystone Junior College, Lehigh County Community College

SOUTHWEST

Arkansas: Garland County Community College, Phillips County Community College; **Louisiana:** Southern University-Shreveport (Bossier City Campus); **Oklahoma:** Southern Oklahoma City Junior College; **Texas:** Clarendon College, Eastfield College, Richland College, Weatherford College

SOUTHEAST

Florida: Central Florida Community College, Manatee Junior College; **Kentucky:** Midway College; **North Carolina:** Beaufort County Technical Institute, Martin Community College, Southeastern Community College, Surry Community College; **Virginia:** Tidewater Community College

MIDWEST

Illinois: Rock Valley College, Southeastern Illinois College; **Iowa:** Waldorf College; **Kansas:** Kansas City Kansas Community College; **Michigan:** Bay DeNoe Community College, Grand Rapids Junior College, Monroe County Community College; **Missouri:** Longview Community College, Maple Woods Community College, St. Paul's College; **South Dakota:** Presentation College

FAR WEST

California: Fresno City College, Skyline College, West Hills College; **Utah:** College of Eastern Utah, Stevens Henager College; **Washington:** Big Bend Community College, Columbia Basin Community College

4-Year Colleges

NORTHEAST

Maryland: University of Maryland (College Park); **New York:** Concordia College, Ladycliff College, State University of New York (Potsdam); **Pennsylvania:** East Stroudsburg State College, Chathan College, Clarion State College, Millersville State College

SOUTHWEST

Arkansas: John Brown University; **New Mexico:** College of the Southwest; **Texas:** East Texas Baptist College, Southwestern Union College, Texas A & M University (College Station)

SOUTHEAST

Alabama: Livingston University, University of South Alabama; **Georgia:** Georgia Southwestern College, Mercer University; **North Carolina:** Wake Forest University; **South Carolina:** Bob Jones University; **Virginia:** Virginia Commonwealth University; **West Virginia:** Wheeling College

MIDWEST

Illinois: Eastern Illinois University, Southern Illinois University; **Kansas:** McPherson College; **Michigan:** Albion College, Madonna College, Olivet College; **Nebraska:** Midland College, University of Nebraska (Omaha); **South Dakota:** Northern State College; **Wisconsin:** Carthage College

FAR WEST

California: San Francisco State University

LOCAL NORMS CHART - LEARNING SKILLS CENTER--MARYGROVE COLLEGE, DETROIT, MICHIGAN

April 3, 1981

Local norms are based upon assessment of all students assigned to Fall and Winter ED 095/105 classes, January 1978--April, 1981. Sample size--approximately 600 students.

*Percentile rank, grade equivalent, age equivalent and standard score designations are based on published data located in the Technical Manuals which accompany the standardized tests. They are all normed nationally and well recognized in the field of educational psychology and learning assessment. The reference group (when appropriate) is indicated in parentheses).

PETERSON-DENNY FORM C PLACEMENT TEST

A raw score of 58 is currently used as the minimum score for designation as full status student in reading and study skills. In other words, a student receiving 58 or higher (full status) would not be required to take ED 095 or ED 105 and probably would not do so.

RAW SCORE	GRADE EQUIVALENT*	PERCENTILE GRADE 13 (FRESHMAN)*	PERCENTILE GRADE 15 (JUNIOR)
58	12.0	27 %	9%

PETERSON-DENNY READING TEST N=576

	ENTRY: Form C			EXIT: Form D			
	GRADE EQUIVALENT*	PERCENTILE FRESHMAN*	PERCENTILE JUNIOR*	GRADE EQUIVALENT*	PERCENTILE FRESHMAN*	PERCENTILE JUNIOR*	GRADE EQUIVALENT CHANGE
Fall, 1980							
ED 095	7.8	4%	1%	10.5	21%	7%	+2.7
ED 105	10.3	13%	3%	12.4	30%	10%	+2.1
Local Norms							
ED 095	8.1	5%	1%	10.9	17%	6%	+2.8
ED 105	9.8	12%	3%	12.3	29%	10%	+2.5

APPENDIX F